



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,104	06/04/2001	Robert E. Haines	10003219-1	6048

7590 02/07/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/874,104

Applicant(s)

HAINES ET AL.

Examiner

Kristie Shingles

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 15 and 17-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 15 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

*Claims 1, 2, 4, 15 and 17 have been amended.
Claims 12-14 and 16 have been canceled.
Claims 21-23 have been newly added.*

Claims 1-11, 15 and 17-23 are pending.

Response to Arguments

I. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks pages 11-13 filed 11/27/2006, with respect to the rejections of claims 1, 6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of *Sears, Jr. et al* (US 6,934,736).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

II. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

III. **Claims 1 – 5 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sears, Jr. et al* (US 6,934,736) in view of *Narin et al* (US 7,039,699).

a. Regarding claim 1, *Sears, Jr. et al* teach a method of requesting a resource having a URL from a WEB server, comprising:

Art Unit: 2141

- a Web client transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (*Abstract, Figures 3 and 4, col.9 lines 4-11, col.11 lines 61-63—client request cookie associated with a selected website from the cookie server*); then
- a Web client receiving a first cookie from the remote computer (*col.2 lines 45-49, col.9 line 28-col.10 line 2—the client receives a cookie from the cookie server*); and
- a Web client transmitting both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the WEB Server (*Figure 3, col.2 lines 49-51—client then connects to the website and provides the cookie to the website*).

Sears, Jr. et al's teaching of connecting to the desired website and providing the cookie to the website implies that the website request and the cookie are both sent to a web server in order to access a customized resource from the website (*col.11 lines 56-60*). Nonetheless, *Narin et al*, explicitly teach that the client includes the cookie in the request for content to the web server (*col.4 lines 14-17, col.9 lines 62-67, col.10 lines 23-31, col.13 lines 38-43*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Narin et al* for transmitting a cookie with the request for a web resource, in order to customize the requested web document accordingly with the user's information.

b. **Claim 21** contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Regarding claim 2**, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Narin et al* teach the method of claim 1, *Narin et al* further teach the method further comprising: the Web client receiving input from a user defining the URL; and wherein the first request transmitting step is automatically performed in response to receiving the user input (*col.9 lines 51-57*).

d. **Regarding claim 3, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Narin et al*** teach the method of claim 2, wherein the first request transmitting step is performed by transmitting the first request over a network to the remote computer (*Sears, Jr. et al: col.9 lines 4-11, col.11 lines 61-63; Narin et al: col.9 lines 51-57*).

e. **Regarding claim 4, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Narin et al*** teach the method of claim 1, *Narin et al* further teach the method further comprising: the WEB client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the WEB server; and in response to receiving the second cookie, the WEB client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage (*col.11 line 66-col.12 line 10*).

f. **Regarding claim 5, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Narin et al*** teach the method of claim 4, wherein the network comprises the INTERNET (*Sears, Jr. et al: col.5 lines 23-25; Narin et al: col.7 lines 25-38, col.8 lines 58-60, col.9 lines 15-25*).

IV. Claims 6-11, 15, 17, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sears, Jr. et al* (US 6,934,736) in view of *Narin et al* (US 7,039,699) in further view of *Quatrano et al* (US 6,748,420).

a. **Regarding claim 6, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Narin et al*** teach a computing device, comprising:

- means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URLs from a first WEB client (*Sears, Jr. et al: col.2 lines 45-49, col.9 line 28-col.10 line 2; Narin et al: col.9 lines 51-57, col.13 lines 7-18—the client receives a cookie from the cookie server for a first website—Narin et al teach the use of domain cookies*);
- means for receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL (*Sears, Jr. et al: Abstract, Figures 3 and 4, col.9 lines 4-11, col.11 lines 61-63—client request cookie associated with a selected website from the cookie server*);

- and means for responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie (*Sears, Jr. et al*: Figures 3 and 4, col.2 lines 45-49, col.9 line 28-col.10 line 2 *Narin et al*: col.11 line 66-col.12 line 10).

Yet *Sears, Jr. et al* and *Narin et al* fail to explicitly teach receiving a first request for a cookie from a second WEB client, and transmitting the first cookie to the second WEB client if the first URL is within the first range of URLs. However *Quatrano et al* teach the sharing of cookies among a group of web clients, wherein a cookie for transmitted to a first user may also be sent to a second user upon request for the URL (col.7 lines 26-col.8 line 52, col.9 lines 16-43, col.15 lines 27-42, col.16 lines 1-7, col.21 lines 45-57, col.22 lines 45-54, col.23 lines 41-60, col.24 lines 41-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Sears, Jr. et al* and *Narin et al* with *Quatrano et al* in order to provide shared access of a website to multiple users, by permitting the sharing of cookies from one client to another without compromising the privacy of each client's information.

b. **Claims 9, 10 and 22** are substantially equivalent to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Claims 15 and 23** contain limitations that are substantially equivalent to claims 1 and 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

d. **Regarding claim 7**, *Sears, Jr. et al* and *Narin et al* with *Quatrano et al* teach the computing device of claim 6, *Quatrano et al* further teach wherein the first WEB client and the second WEB client are two different computing devices (*col.5 lines 26-30*).

e. **Regarding claim 8**, *Sears, Jr. et al* and *Narin et al* with *Quatrano et al* teach the computing device of claim 7, *Quatrano et al* further teach wherein the first cookie receiving means is configured to receive the first cookie from the first WEB client over a network; and wherein the first request responding means is configured to transmit the first cookie to the send WEB client over the network (*col.16 lines 1-7, col.21 lines 45-57, col.22 lines 45-54, col.23 lines 41-60, col.24 lines 41-55*).

f. **Regarding claim 11**, *Sears, Jr. et al* and *Narin et al* with *Quatrano et al* teach the computing device of claim 10, further teach wherein the network comprises the INTERNET (*Sears, Jr. et al: col.5 lines 23-25; Narin et al: col.7 lines 25-38, col.8 lines 58-60, col.9 lines 15-25*).

g. **Regarding claim 17**, *Sears, Jr. et al* and *Narin et al* with *Quatrano et al* teach the system of claim 15, *Narin et al* further teach the system further comprising a monitoring device operable to monitor a first device to detect when the device generates a pre-defined signal and to respond thereto by generating a notification that the signal was generated; and wherein the first WEB client and the second WEB client are operable by a user to retrieve the notification (*col.4 lines 10-22 and 62-67, col.9 lines 57-67, col.10 lines 14-22*).

V. **Claims 18-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sears, Jr. et al* (US 6,934,736) and (US 7,039,699) in view of *Quatrano et al* (US 6,748,420) and further in view of *Silverbrook et al* (US 6,813,039).

a. **Regarding claim 18**, *Sears, Jr. et al* and *Narin et al* with *Quatrano et al* teach the system of claim 17, as applied above, yet fail to teach a printer. However, *Silverbrook et al* teach a printer wherein the sensing device that monitors the status of the printer (Abstract, col.24 lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Sears, Jr. et al*, *Narin et al* and *Quatrano et al* with *Silverbrook et al* by having a monitoring device for a printer; because this allows the users to monitor the printer's status to determine when maintenance is required.

b. **Regarding claim 19**, *Sears, Jr. et al*, *Narin et al* and *Quatrano et al* with *Silverbrook et al* teach the system of 18, *Silverbrook et al* further teach the system comprising: the printer; and wherein the printer includes a replaceable consumable cartridge; and wherein the printer is operable to generate the signal when a consumable in the cartridge moves below a pre-determined level (*col.23 line 50*).

c. **Regarding claim 20**, *Sears, Jr. et al*, *Narin et al* and *Quatrano et al* with *Silverbrook et al* teach the system of claim 19, *Silverbrook et al* further teach wherein the printer is a laser printer (*col.15 lines 30-32*).

Conclusion

VI. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Purpura (6,421,768), Greene et al (2002/0143861), Grandcolas et al (7,137,006), Andrew et al (2002/0073152).

Art Unit: 2141

VII. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds

KENNETH R. COULTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
